

To: CN=Stephanie Skophammer/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Erin
Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Karen
Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Erin
Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Karen
Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]; N=Karen
Cc: []
From: CN=Tom Hagler/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US
Sent: Thur 4/19/2012 10:00:40 PM
Subject: 404 section for this letter
[TMH404Insert.docx](#)

Here is a rewrite that raises the errors in page 8-108, then does a mashup of Erin's and Stephanie's versions.

Three "policy"/tone questions for Karen:

(1) Do you want us to be more specific about what we agree on and disagree on for the 404? The problem I have is that as of today, we don't have any agreement on anything, including the moving target NEPA P+N. So that specific enumeration process will look pretty nasty.

(2) Is there any value in endorsing the Corps letter at this point?

(3) Do we want to point out that the window for NEPA coordination is pretty much gone, or just let it be kind of self-evident? I suppose we could say something along the lines of "The window for coordinating on alternatives analysis in the DEIS is pretty much over, but we should keep talking so that this issue can be addressed between DEIS and FEIS." (Better english would be gooder.)

Finally, I note that the whole description of federal regulatory programs is awkward at best, but I don't think I'm inclined to do their work for them at this point. If it is still this way at the DEIS, we (I) can do a fine tooth comb-over at that point.

Tom Hagler
Assistant Regional Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street, RC-2
San Francisco, California 94105-3901
Phone: (415) 972-3945
Email: hagler.tom@epamail.epa.gov